REMARKS

In the outstanding official action, claims 1-2, 4-6 and 9-13 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi et al in view of Kane et al with claims 3, 7 and 8 being rejected under \$103(a) as being unpatentable over the foregoing references and further in view of the additional cited art, all for the reasons of record.

In response, independent claims 1 and 10 are herewith amended to more particularly and precisely recite the novel and unobvious features of the instant invention, and it is respectfully submitted that these claims, as well as the remaining claims depending therefrom, are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references for the reasons detailed below.

More particularly, independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended to recite a device (claim 1) and method (claim 10) wherein a single storage capacitor (24) is directly connected between a power supply line (26) and the gate of the drive transistor (22) in claim 1, and an analogous method limitation for coupling a power supply line directly to the gate of the drive transistor by a single storage capacitor in claim 10. In this manner, the structure and method of the instant invention are clearly distinguished over Choi, wherein the cited Fig. 2 (and all other embodiments incorporating a shorting transistor M2 corresponding to

the shorting transistor 30 of the instant invention) clearly require the presence of two capacitors C1 and C2.

Furthermore, this distinction is particularly relevant in light of the disclosure on page 3 of the instant specification, at lines 23-24, wherein it is expressly noted that prior-art circuits of this type require two storage capacitors, precisely as shown in Choi. An important commercial advantage of the instant invention, as noted in the instant specification, is that it provides a less complicated circuit to perform the same function, thus making it easier to manufacture large size displays and improve yield, while enabling the pixel aperture to be increased and also for the resolution to be increased (see page 3, line 30-page 4, line 13).

Thus, the combination of Choi and Kane (with there being no suggestion in the Action that Kane shows the device and method of the instant invention as now more particularly recited) is respectfully submitted neither show nor suggest the instant invention.

Furthermore, it is admitted in the Action that Choi fails to disclose that the display device further comprises means for measuring a voltage of a data line. However, Kane was suggested to overcome this deficiency by teaching means for measuring the threshold voltage on the data line. It was suggested that this

combination would have been obvious because such a combination would improve brightness uniformity.

On the contrary, however, it is noted that the object of the present invention it to provide a less complicated pixel drive scheme as well as a simple pixel circuit so as to make the production of large size displays less problematic while improving yield, and also enabling the pixel aperture and resolution to be increased. One of ordinary skill in the art, seeking to accomplish these objectives, would not be motivated to combine Choi with Kane, which has the admitted objective of improving brightness uniformity, absent the benefit of impermissible hindsight derived from the instant disclosure. Finally, it is noted that even if the two references were deemed to be properly combinable, they still would not show or suggest the more particularly-recited device and method of independent claims 1 and 10, in that the circuit of Choi clearly requires two storage capacitors, a defect noted in connection with the prior art in the instant specification, and the particular circuits shown in Kane are of a substantially different configuration and accordingly do not overcome this deficiency.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 10, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references.

Accordingly, allowance of the instant application is respectfully submitted to be justified at the present time, and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven R. Biren, Reg. 26,236

Attorney

(914) 333-9630